

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/532,202	HASENZAHL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> PETER F. GODENSCHWAGER	<b>Art Unit</b> 1767	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) PETER F. GODENSCHWAGER. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Suzannah K. Sundby. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 21 January 2011.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: Those pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: That of record, specifically Ettlinger et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Peter F. Godenschwager/ Examiner, Art Unit 1767	
-----------------------------------------------------	--

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussion concerned the issue of structurally modified silica. With regards to claims 1, 2, and 4, the Examiner maintained the position that the term "structurally modified" is a product by process limitation, and therefore, as long as the prior art (Ettlinger et al.) anticipated all of the claimed structural limitations, it anticipates the claims. With regards to newly added claim 19, it was agreed that Ettlinger et al. does not appear to anticipate the composition of claim 19, as Ettlinger et al. does not disclose the DBP% number as claimed, which has a direct correlation to the degree of structure of the silica. However, further search of the prior art with regards to the DBP% limitation will be conducted.